

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 6 are amended. Because support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 is provided in the application as originally filed, see Figure 5 for example, Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter is presented herein.

Entry of Response Proper

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issues requiring further search and/or consideration on the part of the Examiner as the Amendment merely clarifies the claimed features of the invention; (c) satisfy a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) do not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; and (e) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The Amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to objections raised in the Final Rejection. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Claim Rejection – 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims have been amended in a manner believed to be responsive to the Examiner's rejection. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0068110 to Matsui et al. (Matsui) in view of U.S. Patent Number 1,170,733 to Bower (Bower); as well as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,955,476 to Murai (Murai) in view of Bower.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claims 1 and 6 each recite a cage including, among other features, a pair of annuluses, a plurality of columns interconnecting the annuluses, and pockets defined therein for receiving cylindrical rollers between adjacent columns, the pair of annuluses extending orthogonally relative to the columns, wherein each column is provided with a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base of the column, and wherein each tongue of the pair of tongues is connected to a relatively planar bottom surface and which is disposed between the pair of tongues by an arcuate surface disposed between each tongue of the pair of tongues and an end of the relatively planar bottom surface, each tongue having a planar end face that is coplanar with an outermost surface of a corresponding annulus of the pair of annuluses. See Figures 4 and 5 of the instant application for an exemplary illustration of the emphasized feature(s).

The Office Action admits that Matsui and Murai each fail to disclose a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base of the column.

To cure the admitted deficiency of Matsui and Murai, the Office Action asserts the argument that Bower teaches a pair of tongues (Fig. 2) extending radially away from a base (K) for the purpose of spacing and retaining the rolling members.

However, Applicants note that as show in Figure 2 of Bower, the planar end face of each tongue is oblique relative to each other as well as the annulus (J). Therefore, Bower does not teach or suggest the planar end face of each tongue being coplanar with an outermost surface of the annulus (J) as is recited by Claims 1 and 6. In other words, Bower does not cure or otherwise address the admitted deficiency of Matsui and Murai.

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 6 are not rendered obvious in view of the combined teachings of Matsui/Bower and Murai/Bower, and should therefore be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 10-12 depend from Claim 1. Claims 7-9 and 13-15 depend from Claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reason(s) Claims 1 and 6 are allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of the Claims 1-15, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 100725.00123.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

MO/elp